FILED

		Lodged Proposed On	
1	JOHN D. JACOBS, Bar No. 134154		
2	jjacobs@ftc.gov		
. 3	Federal Trade Commission 10877 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700	N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N N	
4	Los Angeles, CA 90024		
5	(310) 824-4343 (tel.) (310) 824-4380 (fax)	7 09 3:	
6	(310) 624-4360 (1ax)		
7	THOMAS C. GOODHUE		
8	tgoodhue@ftc.gov FRANK M. GORMAN		
9	fgorman@ftc.gov		
-	JAMES A. KOHM		
10	jkohm@ftc.gov Division of Enforcement		
11	Bureau of Consumer Protection	·	
12	Federal Trade Commission 600 Pennsylvania Ave., NW Rm. M-8102B		
13	Washington, DC 20580)ZD	
14	(202) 22 (252) (1) (3		
15	(202) 326-2520 (tel.) (Goodhue) (202) 326-2156 (tel.) (Gorman)		
16	(202) 326-2640 (tel.) (Kohm)		
17	(202) 326-2558 (fax)		
18	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
19	CENTRAL DISTRI	CT OF CALIFORNIA	
20			
21) Case No.: 2:11-cv-06738-CBM-FFM	
22	ANITA WHITE, et al.,) NOTICE OF MOTION AND	
23	D1-:::00-) MOTION OF FEDERAL TRADE	
24	Plaintiffs,) COMMISSION FOR LEAVE TO) FILE BRIEF AS AMICUS CURIAE	
25	VS.)	
	EDEBITPAY, L.L.C., et al.,) Date: September 9, 2013) Time: 11:00 a.m.	
26) Judge: Hon. Consuelo B. Marshall	
27	Defendants.)	
28)	

TO ALL PARTIES AND THEIR COUNSEL OF RECORD:

Please take notice that on September 9, 2013, or as soon thereafter as counsel may be heard by the Court, the Federal Trade Commission ("FTC") will and hereby does move the Court for leave to file the attached brief as *Amicus Curiae*.¹ The FTC – one of the nation's chief consumer protection agencies – has a broad mandate to prevent "unfair or deceptive acts or practices in or affecting commerce." 15 U.S.C. § 45 (a). As part of its mission, the FTC seeks to halt deceptive marketing and unauthorized billing. The Commission has brought many cases against companies who deceptively market their products or bill consumers without authorization.² The FTC thus has considerable expertise in issues related to unauthorized billing and deceptive marketing that may be useful to this Court in evaluating whether the settlement in this case is fair, reasonable, and adequate.

The FTC has also studied how to best protect consumer interests in the class action context and has a tradition of filing *amicus* briefs commenting on potentially

¹ The FTC makes this motion following the FTC's conference with attorneys for Plaintiffs on August 5, 6, and 7, and following the FTC's conference with counsel for Defendants on August 5.

² See e.g., FTC v. Inc21.com Corp., 745 F. Supp. 2d 975 (N.D. Cal. 2010), aff'd 475 Fed. App'x 106 (9th Cir. 2012); Stipulated Order, FTC v. Nationwide Connections and BSG Clearing Solutions, No. 06-80180 (S.D. Fla. Sept. 18, 2008); Stipulated Order, FTC v. Websource Media, LLC, No. H-06-1980 (S.D. Tex. July 17, 2007).

unfair class settlements.³ Importantly, the FTC represents the public interest, in contrast to the parties to this litigation, who represent their own interests. The distinction between public and private interests – and its implications for aiding the court - is evidenced, inter alia, by the fact that in the courts of appeals, where amicus briefs are routinely filed, a United States agency like the Commission may file an amicus curiae brief as a matter of right, whereas non-government amicus curiae are required to obtain either consent of the parties or leave of the court. See FRAP Rule 29. Moreover, as outlined in the FTC's brief, the settlement has serious implications for consumers that the parties have not addressed, including the fact that the settlement would extinguish tens of millions of dollars in claims against the defendants for a mere \$1 million payment, virtually none of which will go to class members. The settlement's notice process is also fundamentally flawed, as it relies primarily on sending inadequate notices to addresses obtained from outdated records.

http://www.ftc.gov/bcp/workshops/classaction/index.shtm.

³ For example, the FTC recently filed a brief in *Moore v. Verizon Communications*, *Inc.*, *et al.* See FTC's Brief as *Amicus Curiae*, *Moore v. Verizon Communications*, *Inc.*, *et al.*, CV-09-1823 SBA (N.D. Cal. Aug. 17, 2012), available at http://www.ftc.gov/os/2012/08/120817mooreverizonamicusbrief.pdf. The FTC also filed a brief as *amicus curiae*, *Vassalle v. Midland Funding*, 3:11-cv-00096 (N.D. Oh. June 11, 2011), available at http://www.ftc.gov/os/2011/06/110621midlandfunding.pdf (challenging, among other things, a broad release of claims). For a list of additional *amicus* filings, see

26

27

28

The FTC's focus on consumer welfare, objectivity, and subject matter expertise make it uniquely situated to comment on the settlement in this case. See e.g., Congregation Etz Chaim v. City of Los Angeles, No. CV-97-5042 CAS (EX), 2009 WL 1293257, at *5 (C.D. Cal. May 5, 2009) ("an individual or organization seeking to participate as amicus curiae must 'make a showing that his participation is useful to or otherwise desirable to the court"); Woodfin Suite Hotels, LLC v. City of Emeryville, No. C-06-1254, 2007 WL 81911, at *3 (N.D. Cal. Jan. 9, 2007) (explaining that "an individual seeking to appear as amicus must merely make a showing that his participation is useful or otherwise desirable to the court") (internal citations and quotations omitted); Sonoma Falls Developers, LLC v. Nevada Gold & Casinos, Inc., 272 F. Supp. 2d 919, 925 (N.D. Cal. 2003) (explaining that amicus status may be granted "concerning legal issues that have potential ramifications beyond the parties directly involved or if the amicus has 'unique information or perspective that can help the court beyond the help that lawyers for the parties are able to provide."") (internal citations omitted); cf. In re Roxford Foods Litig., 790 F. Supp. 987, 997 (E.D. Cal. 1991) (granting amicus status to a government agency where, among other things, agency had oversight authority of act being interpreted). Accordingly, the court should grant the FTC

⁴ The FTC also requests the Court allow it to appear at the Final Approval Hearing.

1	Dated: August 9, 2013	
2		Respectfully submitted,
3		Jhomas C. Goodhue
4		/s/ Thomas C. Goodhue Thomas C. Goodhue
5		Division of Enforcement
6		Bureau of Consumer Protection Federal Trade Commission
7		600 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW, Rm.
8		M-8102B Washington, DC 20580
9		(202) 326-2520
10		JOHN D. JACOBS, Bar No. 134154
11		Federal Trade Commission
12		10877 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 700 Los Angeles, CA 90024
13		(310) 824-4343
14		
15		
16		
17 18		
18		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27-		
28		

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 2 On August 9, 2013, I served a copy of the foregoing on the parties listed below via United States First Class Mail: 3 4 Mike Arias, Esq. (CA Bar No. 115385) marias@aogllp.com 5 Denis M. Delja, Esq. (CA Bar No. 256126) 6 dmdelja@aogllp.com ARIAS OZZELLO & GIGNAC LLP 7 6701 Center Drive West, 14th Floor 8 Los Angeles, California 90045-1558 Telephone: (310) 670-1600 9 Facsimile: (310) 670-1231 10 Karl S. Kronenberger (CA Bar No. 226112) 11 karl@KRInternetLaw.com 12 Jeffrey M. Rosenfeld (CA Bar No. 222187) jeff@KRInternetLaw.com 13 KRONENBERGER ROSENFELD, LLP 14 150 Post Street, Suite 520 San Francisco, CA 94108 15 Telephone: (415) 955-1155 16 Facsimile: (415) 955-1158 17 Attorneys for Plaintiffs 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

MICHAEL L. MALLOW (CA Bar No. 188745) mmallow@loeb.com CHRISTINE M. REILLY (CA Bar No. 226388) creilly@loeb.com MEREDITH J. SILLER (CA Bar No. 278293) msiller@loeb.com LOEB & LOEB LLP 10100 Santa Monica Boulevard, Suite 2200 Los Angeles, California 90067-4120 Telephone: 310-282-2000 Facsimile: 310-282-2200 Attorneys for Defendants Dated: August 9, 2013 Thomas C. Goodhue $/_{\rm S}/$